G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1888-89

SA. 37-8-75-172 191.

(Sc & Pors)

File No. 11 - 8

Serial Nos. 1

Later references.

109

SR. 55-92

37-93-1871.

80-94-1810.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 172

Part B for April 1897.

SUBJECT.

Claim of Inm Desurajurs to the Todd-vencie of his Inam Villages in the Chi-nagancagar & Nanjangud Talaks from Muddappa Calu Koddy, contractor of Mysore District.

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

Sanctd

13/6/92

Note

in of Mr. Devaraj Urs to the toddy revenue of his mamul villages in the Chamrajnagar and and Nanjangode Salukas. from Muddappa late Toddy Contractor of the Mysore District.

In Rev. Misc case 16 of 1907-08, Mr. D-Urs, through his agent Pappanna, claimed Rs 2952-12-0 for the years 1907-08 and 1908-09, as follows:-

Chamrajnagar Saluk villages, at 117-15-6 per m
Nanjangode Saluk villages, at 5-1-0 p. m
123.0.6 p. m

2. The Dy Commr allowed the latter item for 2 years; and the former only for the first year, on the ground that the Contractor had not established shops or tapped trees in the mam villages dur the second year.

Amount awarded = Rs 1537-2-0, with interest at 12 p.c. from 1st April 08

3. Mr. D's appeal was considered by Govt along with several others, by Proc. No 1193 of 28 March 1910. It was there stated that "the Contractor is bound "to pay Mamdars according to custom, "whether or not the Contractor has chosen to exercise the mamul "toddy rights. The Dy Commrs award "is based upon the opposite view & thus "require modification. How much "Mamdars are entitled to toddy revenue "and whether the amounts claimed "are the payments to which they are "entitled acc. to mamul, are matters "on which further investigation is "In the meantime, as the Mamdars concerned has been kept out of their dues for a long time, certain amounts were ordered to be disbursed to them pending [illegible]

A.R. 11-86

Dl (5) in file 223-

neys. The sum thus payable to
case of Mr D, Rs 2 8/53, the exa
ent of his claim.

4. The whole of the moneys received
ove not having been available,
Dy Commr was only able to disburse
3p to Mr D.

Vide encl. to ol. (7).

7. Nothing more was done till
, when the whole matter was
ed in the Dewan's Memorandum
25 March 1892, which, in giving
ecinct history of the correspondence,
ded as follows: "It is not
ssary to pursue [the investigation
the claims of Saunders], as the total
tem has been changed, except
the extent of adjusting old claims.
se claims [of which Mr D's was one]
omise to adjust themselves
ing to the insolvency of the
ol Contractor."

ol. (10)

. No further action can, it is
ilted, be taken on the present
on till the question of recovering
ears due from Meddappa
ch is still under correspondence
ith 3rd/1892, is finally decided.
Submd to seek for orders.
6/4/97.

Recd 5/5/89

12.11.88-1



270 3

To

The Dist Judge of Mysore

Misc. Rev. Appeal No. of 1889

Appellant: Mr Devaraje Urs, by his Agent Papanah.

Respondent - Chika Muthappa Toddy Contractor Hunsur

The appellant above named begs to file this appeal against the order of the Deputy Commr of Mysore dated 21st March 1889 in Rev. Misc. Case No 16 of 1887-88 for the following reasons.

1. The Lower Court has entirely failed to give effect to the various orders and Circulars of the Govt.

2. The view taken by the Dy Commissioner that there should be a reciprocity of rights in the matter is entirely wrong

[illegible] right of

Exhibit 19 and the order of the Govt
of India issued in 1868

3. The right of Inamdars &
the toddy revenue having been
recognized, and the Govt.
having taken away the power
of Inamdars & sell toddy, and
having granted the lease of
toddy & the Contractor on the
Condition of his complying with
all the Conditions the Govt has
imposed on previous Contrac
-tors, the Contractor is bound
by the Inamdars the amount
they have been receiving from
previous Contractors.

4. The Dy Commr has entirely
overlooked the fact that the
Contractor ~~by~~ has evaded the
payment to the Inamdars by
opening no shops in the Inam
villages, but has derived all
the benefit by selling toddy
just at the confines of such

5. The Lower Court has
the circumstance that
appellants has all ale
willing and ready to pursue
Contractor in possession of
the villages & Topes, and called
on him to exchange docu
ments for the due performance
of the Contract, but it was
the Contractor that failed &
Comply with the request of
the Inamdar.
6. The latest proceeding of the
Durbar dated 1886 has laid
in distinct terms that he
does & should Continue
Receive the amount the
have hitherto received
until the Rules on the subj
were altered, and the order
of the Dy Comr is therefore
opposed to the said proceed
7. The Lower Court has failed

allow such amount as the
Appellant would be entitled to
in proportion to the increase in
the aggregate amount of his
contract with Govt as with
regards to the villages whose
claims were allowed.

For these reasons the order of the Dy
Commr Raj be reversed and the
full claim of the appellant may
be allowed with a direction that
the respondents Govt should make
payments forthwith

May 1887

S Subramanya
Respt appellt

The appeal is against award of Toddy Rev. of Village at 117.15.6 per mo, for one year.

The disputed point is whether Contractor becomes exempt, if he abstains from drawing & selling toddy in an Arrack Village.

I would hear the parties at Mysore after my return, fixing ~~a day in the 1st week of January~~ 21st to 24th June for hearing of Mysore parties & Contractors

Ask Dc. of Mysore to submit a statement in accompanying form of claims filed before him by Inamdars for Toddy Rev., amounts involved & cases pending & disposed of —

Also ask him to get from Toddy Contractors a statement of ~~the amounts~~ payments made by them to Each Inamdar for 1887/88 & 1888/89

Say that I would like to have these statements by 10

Name of Village	Amount claimed for 1887/88	88.89.
Whether entitled to Toddy Rev under Inam Settlement		
Amount if any awarded		
Dc. — if any disallowed		
Date of Dept Com's award		
In the claim is pending date when pending claim was filed.		

In the Court of the Deputy Commr
Mysore District

Desayes Claim
A/C
Addl Hosur

Rev. Suit: case No 16 of 1887-88

Present: T. Anandarow Esq: B.A.

Claimant.
Pampanna
Agent of Desayes
by Mr Lobo Kapar
advocate

Respondent
Respts: R.b. Nanjappa
andco - Loddy Contrs
Mysore District

1st Mart
Mr Subbarayan for Claimants
Respt Mr Chikkaveerappa in person

1 Claimant Desayes Journals & Papers
2 Respt Mr Chikkaveerappa's Exhibits
Report & Issues

Judgment

Desayes through his Agent Pampanna claims from the Loddy Contractors of the Mysore District compensation for Toddy revenue of his Srani villages in Channarayan & Nanjangoode Taluks at the rate of Rs 123-4-6 per mensem from 1st Augt 87 upto date say 31st March 89 i.e at Rs 476-6-6 per annum or Rs 952-12 for the two years - The Contractor denies the claim -

2 My views as to the claims & the pleas of the parties upon the claims have been fully explained in the Mehally Case & I need not repeat them here.

32

His Counsel treat the villages of the two Taluks separately - The villages in the Channarayan Taluk

- Bagalay, Jennoor & Rainhally which together form a group and adjoin Ilumnathoor - Of the Rs. 123-4-6 claimed for all claimants villages Rs 117-15-6 appertain to these three villages -

1st The Inamdar has a right to the Koddy revenue of these three villages, which are mentioned in the list of villages the holders of which are recorded in the Inam Registers as having a right to the Koddy revenue and with Inam Sanads dated no 76 of 4th Dec last. The Sanads (Exhibits C.D.& F.) contain the concession -

2nd The amount claimed for these three villages (viz Rs 117-15-6 per annum) is the same as what the late Contractors Davy Muddapa & Co were paying - They had established a Shop at Bagalay and drew Koddy from the Shendi groves which exist to a considerable extent in the three villages, the trees numbering several thousands. The Respt (present Koddy Contractor) denies having taken the Inamdars Koddy except for a very limited time during the C.Y. 1914 which Contract viz (Exhibit K)

that during which he is
respecting as it seems in
the Inamdar. He has
mentioned the exact time
but in the circs (Claimants
mentioning 8 or 9 months as
the period during which the
Respondent was putting him
off with a requisite answer
it does not seem unreasonable
that the Respondent liable
for at least one year on his
own admission - As to
the next year (88-89) the
Claimant admits that no
Shop tax was levied for Toddy
Shop (this is admitted even in
1887) & that what sale there
was at Kapalay was clandestine.
The Toddy trees at Kapalay and
Dicanhally were admittedly
not tapped for Toddy; but the
Claimant saw notices of
Shendi trees last year at Gunnoor,
as to which the Counsel says
that the govt trees and
the Inamdars trees in that
part adjoin so that what the
Claimant saw with his own
in the govt Groves - However
this may be, ~~As the Claim~~ it is clear

at of the Plaintiffs rent
for the year (88-89)
It was after the Respondents
had done nothing even up having
anything to do with the
Plaintiffs rights, so that
it can only form basis for
civil action against the wrong-
doers who unauthorised interfered with them
The next question is
What the Respondent should
be asked to pay to Plaintiff
for the one year 87-88. Plaintiff
Mudabadi paid £117-15-6 for holding in this
for rent & Rents - If the estate (rent)
Respondent had Established & for the use
a shop like his predecessors he of the Plaintiffs
would in the ordinary be liable lands (rent)
to pay this same amount plus
an addition on account of the
increase in the amount of
the first Contract - As he has
not established a shop there it
does not seem unjust neither
side to require Respondent
to pay at the rate paid by his
predecessor - This at £117-15-6 per
annum is £1415-10 for
one year - This is awarded -

Samadhi the village (exhibit
I.) consists the Sadhu cemetery
of the Samadhi, & the village
mentioned in the list read from
the Examination alluded to in
Para 3 (above) - There are
no Lakeshores in the village
with the name - What few
Bay trees there are have
never been tapped for Shendi
The Lake contractors (Dampudapet
& Co) had a shop there and
paid Rs. 5-1-0 per mensem
The Respondent says that he
has not established a shop there
but though the District Register
of licenses issued does not show
that a license was taken
out for a shop in 87-88. the
Register shows that a license
has been taken out for 88-89
& in view of the law & usage which
has prevailed on the part of
the Respondent in taking out
licenses, his vendors being
allowed to sell for long periods of
time on his own ad interim
permits it does not seem to me
to differ from the past practice

amp been taken out for the current year and today being held in the current year (Exhibit H) that body was held last year also - I would therefore award the amount claimed which is the same as what the predecessors Respondents paid viz at Rs 5-1 per mensem or Rs 60-12 per annum. That is Rs 121-8 for the two years ending 31st March 1907 -

7/ In the result the Respondents are hereby directed to pay Rs 1537-2 with interest at 12 per cent per annum from 1st August 06 -

I Rama Rao
Dy C 21st March 07

Note Exhibits attached

In the Court of the Dy Commissioner
Mysore District

Revenue Mis: case No: 165 of 1887-88

Present T. Ananda Row Esq: B.A.

Claimant
Pansanna
Agent of Devanajetto
by Mr. Soobaroyer
Advocate.

Respondent
Mr. R. C. Rudd
-dappa & Co
Contractors
Mysore Dt.

1st March

Mr. Soobaroyer for claimant

Respondent Mr. Chik Muddappa in person.

1 & claimant Devanjetto Gumasta Pansanna is examined.

2. Respondent Mr. Chik Muddappa is examined.

Judgment

Devanjetto through his agent claims from the Toddy Contrac- -t- - of the Mysore District

Copy applied for 23-3-89
Do ready 28-3-89
Do delivered 28-3-89

No of words 1000 — 1
Copying fee 4-15-4
Comparing fee 4-5-4
Paper cost 4-4-6
1-4-14

of his Inam villages in Chan-
rayapatnam and Ranjangode Taluks
at the rate of Rs: 123-4-6 per
annum from 1st April 87 upto
to date say 31st March 89 i.e
at Rs: 1476-6-4 per annum or
Rs. 2952-12-8 for the two years.
The Contractor denies the claim.

2 My views as to the relations
between the parties and the form
of rules upon which claims be-
tween Inamdar and Zaildy
Contractor should be settled
having been fully explained
in the Dwellally case it is need-
less to repeat them here.

3 It is convenient to treat the
villages of the two Taluks separately.
The villages in the Channapatnam
Taluk are Bagatay, Jann

amas ~~[illegible]~~ which lay
form a group and adjoin Com-
-munthoor. Of the Rs: 123-4-6
claimed for all claimants village
Rs: 117-15-6 appertain to these
three villages.

4. The Inamdar has a right
to the toddy revenue of these
three villages, which are men-
-tioned in the list of villages the
holders of which are recorded
in the Inam Registers as having
a right to the toddy revenue re-
-ceived with Inam Superintende
-dochi's No 76 dated 4th December
last. The sannads (exhibits C.D
and H) contain the concession

5. The amount claimed for
these three villages (viz) Rs: 117-15-6
per annum) is the same as
what the late Contractors

Rs.

avy Mudaliyar (one [illegible] saying.
They had established a shop
at Bagalay and drew Toddy from
the Shendi groves which exist to a
Considerable extent in the three
villages, the trees numbering
several thousands. The Respon-
dent (present toddy Contractor)
denies having taken the Inam-
dars toddy except for a very
limited time in the early
part of the period of his Con-
tract viz) that during which
he was negotiating as to terms
with the Inamdar. He has not
mentioned the exact time. But
in the Circumstances (claimant
mentioning 8 or 9 months as
the period during which the
Respondent was putting him
off without a definite answer)

it does not seem extravagant
holds the Respondent liable for
at least one year on his own
admissions. As to the next year
(88-89) the claimant admits that
no shop tax was levied for toddy
shops (this is admitted even for
1887) and that what sale there
was at Bagalay was Kk.
was at Bagalay clandestine. The
toddy groves at Bagalay and
Dhanvhalli were admittedly
not tapped for toddy, but the
claimants are prohibited to
shendi trees last year at Jemo
as to which the Contractor says
that the Government groves and
the Inamdars' groves in that
part adjoin so that what trees
claimants says with foto are
in the Government groves.

however this may be, it is clear that if the Inamdars' trees were lopped this year (1889) it was after the Respondent had distinctly given up having anything to do with the Inamdars' rights, so that it can only form subject for a Civil action against the individuals who unauthorizedly interfered with them. The next question is what the Respondent should be asked to pay to claimant for the one year 87-88. It appeared that the lopped paid Rs: 117-15-6 for the standing toddy in the village (Excise) and for the use of the Inamdars' groves (rent). If the Respondent had established a shop like his predecessors he would in the circumstances be liable to pay this same amount plus

an addition in proportion
increase in the amount of
Government Contract. As he has
not established a shop there it
does not seem unjust to either
side to require the Respondent to
pay at the rate paid by his pre
-decessor. This at Rs: 117-15-6 per
mensem is Rs: 1415-10 for one
year. This is awarded.

6. Next as to Hookera village
in Ranjangode Taluk. The samvan
of the village (Exhibit E') Conceded
the Toddy revenues to the Inamdar
and the village is mentioned in
the list received from the Inam
Superintendent alluded to in
para 4 above). There are no
dade groves in the village worth
the names. What few stray trees
there are have never been tapped
for Shendi. The late Contractors
(Davy Dmuddapppa & Co) had a
shop there and paid Rs: 5-1-0

in reversed. The Respondent says that he has not established a shop there; but though the District office Register of licenses issued does not show that a license was taken out for a shop in 1887-88, the Register shows that a license has been taken out for 1888-89, and in view of the laxity which has prevailed on the part of the Respondent in taking out licenses, his vendors being allowed to sell for long periods of time on his own ad interim permits it does not seem to me safe to infer from the fact of a licenses having been taken out for the current year and toddy being sold in the current year (Exhibit H) that toddy was sold last year also. I would therefore award the amount claimed which is the same as what the Respondent to

predecessors paid away at Rs
per mensem or Rs: 60-12 per annum
that is Rs: 121-8 for the two years
ending 31st March 1889.

7. In the result the Respon-
-dent is hereby directed to pay
Rs. 1537-2 with interest at 12
per cent per annum from and
after 1st April 1889.

Sgd/ J. Ananda Rowe
Dy Commissioner
Mayore Roads

Dated 21st
March 1889

"Copy"

Compd
Bracanier
Albian clerk
28/3/89

J. Ananda Rowe
for Rev: Sinnastamby
Mayore District



14

In the court of the Dy: Com:
Mysore District
Rev: Dis: Case No: 7 of 1888-89
Present:- Ananda Rao Esqre B.
Petitioner
Venkapia & Others
vs
R. G. Muddapa & Co. Lodky Contractor
1st March/89.
Mysore.
Mr Subarayer for Claimant
Mr Chick Muddapa Respt in pers.
1. Claimant-Venkpia is Exd.
2. Respt Mr Chick Muddapa is Examined-
Judgment-reserved
Sd/- L. Ananda Rao

Judgment

This is a claim by Venkappa Inamdar of Kelhally Inam village in the Yelandur Jaghir Mysore Distt against the Lodky Contractor Mr Chick Muddapa for -

Com'n Allowed - 23-3-89
Rs - Ready - 30, 5, 80
Rs - Received - 2-4-89

cony receive of the Inam
dage. The amount is at the
ate of Rs: 17.14.6 per mensem
from 1st April 87 upto date say
31st March 89 ie. a sum of Rs: 214.14
per annum Rs. 429.12 - for the two years -
2. This Inam village is situated
within the limits of Geladuv Jaghir.
The Statement received from the Inam
Suptt: with his docket No: 7 of 4th
Decr last which is a list of Inam
villages the holders of which are
recorded in the Inam Registers
as having a right to the kodyre:
venue does not contain the name
of this village - It however mentions
the "Geladuv Jaghir".
Exhibit No. 11 is the Kumad of the
village - It mentions no mention of
Cocoanut trees or the produce thereof -
But in a petty received from
the Amildar giving the details of
the heriz of the village income for
1887 it is included - There are shown
Cocoanut trees in the village numbering
more than 200 & scattered here
there according to the admissions
the Claimant - The Respondent
says they are not bodily grown with
the Inam - From these circum:
stances I infer that the Inamdar
has a right to the kodoly revenue
of

Report No: 529
of 8th Octr: 88
with
Kumad & Gadi
No: 13 of 1-11-88-

of his village!
3. The Respondent denies claim
claim.
4. The facts are admitted - Pre
= vious Contractors did not tap
Kheudi trees but they established
a shop within Iruan village li
= mits & paid the Iruandar the
last payment being at the rate
of Rs: 17 - 14 - 6. The present Con
= tractor (Respondent) has not
tapped the Iruandar's Date
trees & has not established a shop
in Iruan village limits - The Co
= tractor has established a shop
out of but near Iruan Village -
limits - The question is whether
he is liable to pay the Iruanda
in these circumstances - On
behalf of the Iruandar it is
argued that the Contractor
must pay whether or not he ex
= ercises the Iruandar's rights
long as he is free to exercise
them just as he is bound to
pay for the Coitrael Amu
whether or not he taps for trees
& draws toddy - It is contended

on behalf of the Contractor that no payment is due as no body was drawn from Inamdar's date trees nor any body sold within Inam village limits.

5. It seems expedient that I should explain the view I have been led to take of the relations of the parties on a consideration of the question generally & of the exhibits produced in this case in particular.

6. Exhibit No: 19 shows that a conflict by competition arising between vendors of Govt body & vendors of Inamdar's body attended by consequences inimical to both interests, Inamdars were directed to sell their right to the Govt Contractor alone the latter paying the Inamdar the actual receipts of the immediately preceding year or the average of the preceding 5 years receipts whichever was acceptable to the Inamdar concerned. In 1868 the Govt of India having directed that of the extra items of revenue

the

the Layer & abbary should where
they have also been alienated
be returned & reserved for the
Govt as a State monopoly, this
order was carried out as follows-
where the enjoyment of these
items was an authorised they
were of course resumed returned

Where they were supported by
repress Customs or Customs of 30
or 20 years standing there was
every disposition to allow the
Inamdar the income which
he was then deriving, for all
time where the right was sup
= ported by Sanyad Custom, the in=
= come to be so allowed was
taken at an average of the
preceding ten years receipts-
In the case of joint quit-rent
paying villages the Inamdar's
deducted the amount of this
income from the combined
quit-rent payable on the
Village - But such a settle=
ment could not be effected
in =

* Grant for a term years
& is dissolved by Succession &
by Custom,

... case of Kiwanuya Villages
with regard to Jodi & Quit rent to
Govt & the Scheme suggested proposed
in his letter No: 165 of 25th July 72
that a Cash Certificate should
be issued for the income to be
allowed for the Cash Certificate
like a Guzzarai ready Grant
Grant being Commutable
into land at the Survey Settle-
-ment- Sir Richard Meade
the then Chief Commissioner
approved of & sanctioned this
Course on the understanding
that it should be applied only
to Cases in which the alienat-
-ion authorised by the Sunnuds
was still enjoyed by the Grantees-
With a view to extending this
system of Cash Certificates to
Kayengetta Villages also in-
-quiries were ordered as to the
Existence of such alienations
in Kayengetta Villages - In the
meanwhile it was pointed
out that the issue of such
Cash Certificates and their
subsequent ...

subsequent Commutation
into land would rest with the
Inamdar the value of the lag
+ abkary items even after Govt.
reduced or abolished them
sources of provincial revenu
In consequence of this, instead
of cash receipts Commutable
into land a system of pay
=ment of actual receipts
Govt on account of abkary (the
Inclusive toddy) was ordered
Chief Commissioners Proceedin
No: 3697 - Rev: 30 dated 8th Oct:
was ordered - These orders are
still in force and form the bas
upon which all questions of the
kind now before me have to b
decided - When abkary was du
=ly under Govt management a
=counts were kept of toddy dra
from or sold in Inam Villag
and the actual receipts were
paid. Where Inamdars had
their own trees in their Villages bu
there was a demand for toddy
Govt toddy was supplied to the
Inamdars -

Inandar at first cost the Inam-
dar selling it & taking the profits-
The meaning of this most favorable
to the Inandar is that Govt even
recognized in the Inandar tenure
a right to exercise Revenue also-
When Govt farmed out its Toddy
Revenue to a Contractor, the Inam-
dars were left to settle terms
with the Govt Contractor & in cases
of dispute the Dy. Collr was re-
quired to decide between them-
The Contractors were able
to make settlements with the Inam-
dars by either paying actual
receipts or stipulating for an
amount equal to past receipts-
In course of time & with in-
crease of population & of the
General prosperity of the labor-
ing classes Toddy Revenue in-
creased & the amount of the
Contract with Govt increased
also as a consequence of com-
petition with a narrowing of the
margin of profit to the Contract
disputes arose which the parties
would not settle among themselves-

The

The class of questions which fir
cropped up was as to whether a
Govt. Contractor should pay the
privileged Inamdar (therein
being equal) an amount in
excess of previous payments
in proportion to the excess of the
amount of his contract over the
amount of the previous con-
-tract with the Govt. The pro-
-portionate increase claim-
-ed by the privileged Inamdar
was sanctioned, & the privileged
Inamdars were thus allowed
a determination of the basis
on which an award should be
made by the Dy. Comr. in cases
in which he had to decide be
-tween the privileged Inamdar
& the Govt. Contractor, the former
tenacious of his rights & the latter
inclined to take undue advantage
of his "exclusive right" to sell-
The question was raised by
the Dy. Comr. of Bangalore in
+ -/81 in which in the absence of
11th Augt. /81- accounts

* to participate in the proceeds
of the improved revenue.
Inflation of quotations which
cropped up ensued

Bks
IM

account showing receipts on
account of the privileged Enam-
dars ~~Estate~~ alone, an average
of the past 5 or ten years revenue
was supported with a proviso
that if the Govt Contractor de-
clined this award the previ-
leged Enamdar should be at liberty
to find a market for his own crop
Pending the disposal of the
question of resuming the rights
of privileged Enamdars in regard
to Kodry, the adoption of 5 years
average was sanctioned in
Revenue Pro: Go: 4533/190 of 30 Augt: 81
The case under disposal belongs
to the third class of cases in
which the Contractor does not
exercise the Enamdars rights
It seems to me that there
ought to be a reciprocity of
rights in this matter, & just
as the Enamdar privileged is
free to decline to lease his trees
to the Contractor when he deems
it necessary to give his own workers
the trees next (para 3 of the
Chief

Chief Commissioner's Pro: Rev: 24
Rev: 21 of 19th June 75 print
at page 155 of the Revenue Dt
Manual 1885), to the Contractor
must be free to decline to exercise
the Inamdar's rights when he is
unable to do so except at a loss-
the Contractor being in the place
of Govt relatively to the Inamdar,
the Inamdar being entitled
only to actual accruing re=
=ceipts & no receipts having
accrued in this
case, the Contractor, it seems
to me is no more liable to pay
& the Inamdar entitled to a
payment - than Govt would be
liable to pay in the circum=
=stances.
6. The Claim is therefore dismissed.

sd/- T. Anandarao
Dy Commissioner

20th Mar: 89

"Copy"

Compd.
Bhagwanlal
Assistant Clerk

T. Ramachandra Rao
Rev: Hd Draughtsman

6-4-89

received

Clerk's Dept Rec
Kirwin Case
Attorney Case

12/3/38
184

[illegible]

ಕಾಲಿಗೆ ಹೆಜ್ಜೆಯಿಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಸಂಸಾರ ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು - ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು - ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸಾರ ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು? ಸಂಸಾರ ಮಾಡಿತ್ತು ಎಂದರೆ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕಸಂಪ/ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ/ಪ್ರಸಾರಾಂಗ/ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯ

ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ

ಸಂಪಾದಕರು ಪ್ರಜಾವಾಣಿ ದಿನಪತ್ರಿಕೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಕಾಳಜಿಯ ವಿಷಯವೊಂದನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಲು ಈ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಇತ್ತೀಚಿನ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಲವಾರು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೇಲ್ಸೇತುವೆಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ਮੈਂ ਸੁਖਜਿੰਦਰ ਸਿੰਘ ਪੁੱਤਰ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰਮੇਲ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਾਸੀ ਪਿੰਡ ਮਹਿਮਾ

ਕਲਾਂ ਤਹਿਸੀਲ ਅਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਬਠਿੰਡਾ ਦਾ ਰਹਿਣ ਵਾਲਾ ਹਾਂ ਮੇਰੀ ਉਮਰ

ਲਗਭਗ ਸਤਾਈ ਸਾਲ ਹੈ ਮੈਂ ਆਪਣੇ ਪਿੰਡ ਦੇ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿੱਚ

ਦਸਵੀਂ ਜਮਾਤ ਤੱਕ ਪੜ੍ਹਿਆ ਹੈ ਮੇਰੇ ਪਿਤਾ ਜੀ ਖੇਤੀਬਾੜੀ ਕਰਦੇ

ਹਨ ਅਤੇ ਮੈਂ ਵੀ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਲ ਖੇਤੀ ਦੇ ਕੰਮ ਵਿੱਚ ਹੱਥ ਵਟਾਉਂਦਾ

ਹਾਂ। ਮੇਰੇ ਕੋਲ ਆਪਣੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੈ ਮੈਂ ਠੇਕੇ ਉੱਤੇ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ

ਲੈ ਕੇ ਖੇਤੀ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ। ਮੇਰੇ ਕੋਲ ਇੱਕ ਟਰੈਕਟਰ ਅਤੇ ਇੱਕ

ਮੋਟਰਸਾਈਕਲ ਹੈ ਜਿਸ ਉੱਤੇ ਮੈਂ ਆਉਂਦਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਹਾਂ। ਮੇਰੇ ਪਰਿਵਾਰ

ਵਿੱਚ ਮੇਰੇ ਮਾਤਾ ਪਿਤਾ ਤੋਂ ਇਲਾਵਾ ਮੇਰੀ ਪਤਨੀ ਅਤੇ ਦੋ ਬੱਚੇ

ਹਨ। ਮੇਰੀ ਪਤਨੀ ਘਰੇਲੂ ਔਰਤ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਬੱਚੇ ਅਜੇ ਛੋਟੇ ਹਨ।

ਮੈਂ ਆਪਣੇ ਪਰਿਵਾਰ ਨਾਲ ਬਹੁਤ ਖੁਸ਼ ਹਾਂ ਅਤੇ ਆਪਣੀ ਜ਼ਿੰਦਗੀ

ਤੋਂ ਸੰਤੁਸ਼ਟ ਹਾਂ।

ਸੁਖਜਿੰਦਰ ਸਿੰਘ

ਮਹਿਮਾ ਕਲਾਂ ਤਹਿਸੀਲ ਅਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਲ੍ਹਾ ਬਠਿੰਡਾ

ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಮಾಲೀಕರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಅಂಗಡಿಯ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

Hearing on "Screenplay"
Diamond Bhalla
22-1-43.

COURT FEE
Bombay
R. 20
EIGHT ANNAS

Bhalla
Kamath
Heard
Heard Khare
Counsel

473

[illegible]

SUPERINTENDENT
MYSORE
DISTRICT
COURT

ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಸಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಪರಿಷತ್ತು

Recorded
Page 82
Augusta
2. 4. 76.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

644

2-7-81 [illegible]

[illegible]

A 49

No. 881

B 5204

1962

Copy

141

Extract

Extract from the Proceedings of the Commissioner of Nagpur Division for the month of October 1881.

Subject: Application of Mr. Ramchandra Vinayak Kanitkar, Pleader, Wardha, for permission to practise in the Court of the Deputy Commissioner of Wardha.

Mr. Ramchandra Vinayak Kanitkar, Pleader, Wardha, has applied for permission to practise in the Court of the Deputy Commissioner of Wardha. He has produced a certificate of enrolment as a Pleader, dated 23rd October 1881, and has paid the fee of Rs. 10 prescribed by Rule 473 of the Rules for the Practice of the Courts of Judicature in the Central Provinces.

The Commissioner has no objection to the grant of the permission applied for.

Commissioner of Nagpur Division

Deputy Commissioner of Wardha

Received 24th October 1881

Wardha Civil Court

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਚ ਸ੍ਰੀਮਤੀ ਸੁਰਿੰਦਰ ਕੌਰ ਬਾਦਲ ਜੀ ਨੂੰ ਸ੍ਰੀ ਅਕਾਲ ਤਖਤ ਸਾਹਿਬ ਤੋਂ

ਦਾਸ ਨੂੰ ਸੇਵਾ ਦਾ ਮੌਕਾ ਬਖਸ਼ਿਆ ਜਾਵੇ ਜੀ।

ਮਿਤੀ 19/12/88

Notice

To
Messrs. R.B. Moodaliyaar & Co:
Toddy Contractors
Mysore District

Whereas one Pampama, Agent of Mr. Deseraje Urs, Mysore, has preferred a complaint against you stating that the Toddy Revenue of the Bagaliveu Inam villages of Mr. Deseraje Urs in Chamarajanagar Taluk, has been withheld by you since April 1887, you are hereby required to pay up the Amount due to him at once or to appear before the undersigned & show cause why it should not be paid, at 1 P.M. on Wednesday the 19th December 1888, either in person or by an Authorized Agent with necessary documents on which you intend to rely in support of your defence; Otherwise the case will be heard and determined in your absence.

Given under my hand and seal this 15th day of November 1888.

Commissioner
Mysore District.

[illegible] 5

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 22 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 23 [illegible] 1889 [illegible]

[illegible]

M. C. M.

Notice

No 23
6

To

Messrs. R.L. Muraddappa & Co
Toddy Contractors
Mysore District

The Abkari case of Lr. Vs
Bagali & ors villages, belonging to
Mr. Devarajaiah, having been posted
for final hearing on 1st March/89
you are hereby required to appear
before the undersigned at 11 A.M.
on that day either in person or by
an authorized agent. In default,
the case will be heard & determined
ex parte.

Mysore. Dated 23 Jany 1889

Asst Commr
Mysore District

To

[illegible]

Presented on 1-3-89

[illegible]

The Court of the Dy. Commissioner of [illegible]

[illegible] 1888

[illegible] agent

of the [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

accepted

[illegible]

ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಧಾರವಾಡ ಪೀಠದಲ್ಲಿ

ಕ್ರಿಮಿನಲ್ ಅಪೀಲ್ ನಂ. ಕ್ರಿ.ಅ.ನಂ. ಸಾವಿರದ ಒಂಭೈನೂರ ಎಪ್ಪತ್ತೊಂಭತ್ತು

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ನ್ಯಾಯಮೂರ್ತಿಗಳವರು

ಅಪೀಲುದಾರ — ಶ್ರೀ .

ವಿರುದ್ಧ

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ

ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಕೀಲರು —

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಸರಕಾರಿ ವಕೀಲರು —

ಈ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಇಂದು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಸರಕಾರಿ ವಕೀಲರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಇವರುಗಳು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಕೀಲರು ಮಾಡಿದ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಸರಕಾರಿ ವಕೀಲರು ಮಾಡಿದ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕೇಸಿನ ಕಾಗದಪತ್ರಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ತೀರ್ಪನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ —

ಈ ಅಪೀಲು ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಸೆಷನ್ಸ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಧಾರವಾಡ ಇವರು ಸೆಷನ್ಸ್ ಕೇಸ್ ನಂ. ಸಾವಿರದ ಒಂಭೈನೂರ ಎಪ್ಪತ್ತೆಂಟರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ದಿನಾಂಕ ೨೧-೧೨-೧೯೭೮ ರ ತೀರ್ಪಿನ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ತೀರ್ಪಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಐ.ಪಿ.ಸಿ. ಕಲಂ ೩೦೨ ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ವಿಧಿಸಿದ್ದು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರು ಸದರಿ ತೀರ್ಪಿನ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಈ ಅಪೀಲನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಕೀಲರು ಮಾಡಿದ ವಾದವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರು ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮಾಯಕರಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಳ್ಳಾಗಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರು ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರು ಮೃತಳಾದ ಸಾವಿತ್ರಿಯ ಗಂಡನಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮದುವೆಯಾಗಿ ೧೨ ವರ್ಷಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಕ್ಕಳಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಪೀಲುದಾರರು ಮೃತಳಾದ ಸಾವಿತ್ರಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಅನುಮಾನ ಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು

ಕಂಡಾಗ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲ ಅವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನುಕಂಪ ಹುಟ್ಟಿಸುವಂತೆ ಇರುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರ ಮಾತುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬಾಲ್ಯದ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳು ಹೊರಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದವು. ಅವರ ಅಪ್ಪ ಅಮ್ಮ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಕಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟು ಓದಿಸಿದರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರ

Taken before me

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore

1/3/89

[illegible]

1887-88 [illegible] 16

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ([illegible]
I [illegible]) [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1861 [illegible]
[illegible] 1801 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
1398 [illegible]
1978 [illegible]
1476-6 [illegible]

1887 ನೇ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಗಾಲ ಉಂಟಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಕಿ ಹೇರಳವಾಗಿ ಬೆಳೆದಿತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು. ಆಗ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯ ಬೆಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಅಗ್ಗವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯ ಬೆಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದಾಗ ಸಾಗಣೆಯ ಖರ್ಚು ಸೇರಿ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯ ಬೆಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುವುದು. ಆಗ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುವುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಏರ್ಪಾಡಾಯಿತು. ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ದಿವಾನರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಶೇಷಾದ್ರಿ ಅಯ್ಯರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದಾಗ ಅವರು ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆಗ ಬಳ್ಳಾರಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಾಯಿತು. ಆಗ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯ ಬೆಲೆ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಬಡವರು ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕಷ್ಟಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆಗ ಶೇಷಾದ್ರಿ ಅಯ್ಯರ್ ಅವರು ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಅಕ್ಕಿಯನ್ನು ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದರು.

[illegible]

[illegible] 1861 [illegible] 1887 [illegible] 16 [illegible]

[illegible] 1887 [illegible]

Taken before me

1/3/89

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore

In the Court of the Deputy Commissioner Nuggihalli

Rev: Abkari Dist: case No 16 of 1887-88

Deposition of Chikmadappa

Age 32

Race
Religion } Koruchiyar

Father's name Nanjanna

Resident of Nugge

Occupation Abkari contractor.

On solemn affirmation

I hear the petition presented by Papanna Appaji Desayi on Oct 26/1888 - I deny the claim because I have not used the fraudulent toddy nor did I in fraudulent manner in the petition - I had been absent three months ago - Papanna the headman told me that the trees were being tapped. I inquired of him and the lands on which the trees stood are govt land not Papanna's land - Papanna knows well our having declined to draw the fraudulent toddy - Inspite of his fraudulent as well as bribes to draw his

title to the Kandy revenue thus vested -
Heera Papanna came to me
and did not show the damnad -

Dep^t affirmant recalled

When I found it too much to pay as
per promise on chadno and thereupon
declined to use the Kandans toddy -
He may hereby have drawn toddy
for a short time after we stopped -
Hereafter I can mention on a
separate document - For this period
I can say what may be ordered -

By the pharayer / I was partner
~~with~~ in the contract previously mine
which stood in the name of Dasappa Mudaliar
C.C. Kuchalika was employed -
I see the paper now shown me - Marked A
for the Kuchalika by which Dasappa
Mudaliar C^o agreed to pay Rs 123-6-6
per mensem - Payt was made
accordingly - My contract began on
1st April 87 - I did not make Hatti pay^t,
that I did not want the Kandans
toddy - ~~The Kandan villages~~ from 1887
& 1888 Dasappa Mudaliar C^o were
contractors - We used to take Kanter
into agreements with Kandans for
their toddy - There was no obligation on
our part to take Kandan's toddy whether
or not we desired it - The Kandans have

right to draw toddy & ~~drawing~~ free
~~toddy~~ selling — they cannot sell toddy —
the exclusive right of vending toddy rests
vested in the Contractor — the contract
formerly about 87 also required mutual
agreement between Contractor and
the Inamdar — the Contract is that
I should draw toddy and sell in
Inam villages limits only with the consents
of the Inamdar — the contract gave
me right to draw & vend toddy in Pts
villages — very possibly Darkhast case
& established rules in the villages now
in question in this case — there may be
toddy drinkers in these villages — I did not give
written notice believing to take Inamdars
toddy in this case — I only told Rapanna
personally — He is in custody — I do not
see Med whether I wrote or asked
personally for inspection of the claimants'
Inamdar — I have not recorded any
inquiries made on the spot as to
the drawing of toddy from Inam villages
limits — I may know the claimant
with drawing & vending toddy — If I knew
it I should not because I have the
exclusive right of selling toddy and
the claimants right has been hard-
-ened to me — the Inamdar cannot
draw & vend toddy, but he may make
[illegible] with toddy, as he demands &c.

the amount they contract to speaker
than the amount my predecessors -
It is more profitable to me to sell
for 8 Mayes for Potty than to pay the
Claimant Saunders. What he claims
and sell his Potty. I cannot mean
that the Saunders wife do not think
the Potty sell in the Notes Name
established for breeding for Potty - The
amount which Dan Mustapha
& Co last paid to the ~~Contractor~~ Claimants
for, to represent the fair value of three
Saunders Potty - Dan Mc & Co could pay
Potty What they had insured to pay
(1891) because they had to insure
themselves - The Saunders Potty was
worth that sum -

Read & Represent in
Canada Certified Cheque

In the Court of the Dep. Commissioner
Mysore District

Rev. Alienation: Case No 16 of 87-88

Deposition of ~~Dapanna~~

Age 57
Race
Religion } Hindu Brahmin
Father's name Seshya
Resident of Mysore
Occupation Agent to Devaraj Aru's Estates

On solemn affirmation

Bagaly, Junoor, & Denkally in the Chamarajpet Taluk belonged to Devaraj Aru's Inamdar - The villages were under Dyo's management from 1861 &c." by Govt Thanah - During this period the Tasty revenue of the villages was being collected by the Govt from the Inamdar Patty Contractors - Extracts from Accounts of these Inam villages and Collected - Muchalikas & Pattas were prepared by me - The Dy Comm^r the Assistant - In one Contract #1398 ~~1881~~ was the annual rent - In another Contract #1972-73-1 was the annual

rent - In the next Paras 1476-6 - 66
Cooks were made at these rates
the last mentioned amount 1476-6 was
paid by South Papanam Rs & also the
succeeding Rayapuddah Rs. Pay &
were issued till 31 March 1887. Ch
Kuttuppudapa is the succeeding
present Contractor. I have demanded
pay & gratuity at the rate of Rs 1
per person but was paying Rs 1 per
person in addition to the increase
in the Govt Contract amount. I see
no reply to my demand
that the Contractor had execute
the Cooly Patta. I spoke
repeatedly & personally
repeatedly & personally - I asked personally
& properly either - Chokkanadden
did tell me that he will take the
Rs 1 per days Coly & the Rs 1 per
person & less amount - I said the
Rs 1 per & less amount
Rs 1 per day being the Contractor's
property bearing the Contractor's
pay more in addition to the increase
in the Govt Contract. In Cooly a
Rs 1 per day Chokkuppudapa tells
Rs 1 per day Clandestinely. I made inquiries
& received the same & reported to Dr C -
& see paper now shown to me - Mrs
the Rs 1 per day as much petty in which

T
Marked
B

2/-

The Maharajas are also recorded -
The Kandian witness body is conveyed
on the Kannadapattaya alleys - Kumara
& Dambally were formerly Kayamputtan
villages - They were changed into villages
by nicknp - The nicknp succeeds body
lights - Produce the nicknp - Also the
Kannad conversation alleys into Tamil
Produce also the Pattaya & Mahabe
alleys sounds -

(Report) No body has been drawn
in Pattaya alleys by the Contractor from
Mapaga - I cannot say whether the
Contractor was selling body within
the alleys always - But heard complaints
reports then & did threaten & ended
that I found - The details are mentioned
in the Maharajas - The body was being
sold at the door of Tamil Pariahs & in the
Cattleshed of Hakkadda -
I did not ask by whose orders they were
selling & from when - I recorded their
statements. The Maharajas was recorded
in the presence & stated the fact whether
or not the body was being sold in the
alleys - Body for Mosque & the
places from the Contractors depot at
Kannamoppa has to pass through
Pattaya The Muslims who resided under

the Jennis Contract was in Rikka
& had cancelled. I don't suppose I
could tell me whether or not he
was selling under the Contractor as
Sheikmidars or as an employee?
I don't know on whose behalf they were
tendering lately - They could not be
tendering lately Munroe than as the
Contractors lessees - I think 8 or 9 months
from 1st April 87 & Munro despatched
that the Contractor would not take
the Iron lately for the same amount
as they had before - I was there
that 9 months Mr Munroe - I don't always
live in the Mess but I was only
occasionally - This account from my
diary is made up three days in the dates
mentioned in the Memoranda - The
Jetty Contractor did not do a very thriving
business & I think during those
3 Months or 4 perhaps were being made
with other Iron Piers - Iron mixed very
Superior - Bagaly is about 30 or 35 miles
from the Contractors depot at Hackner -
The Hammam the Iron depot is about
5 miles - I don't know whence they
bring the Iron to the Hammam depot -
There are many Kafirs in Bagaly - There
may be about 1000 Kafirs & Christians
The Hotel & Warehouse of the Major &

3/

object of mine nevertheless are unlawfully established; but not the place
of meeting should be changed from one place
to another as occasions may require. Ac-
cordingly the last day in November - Novem-
ber was appointed for 87 - October was as
usually established - The January time
as much is made every alternate
month from April 87 - See what
Steps are kept & what not kept. The
Steps are appointed a number of days
as steps are found & cast - and. Then
was worship in Aunt - I do not know -
Whether Hotts Cattle dishes are licensed -
See in the Main place see whether or
not steps kept & taxes accurately.
There is no steps altogether now - There
was one under Ivens's contracts -
On one occasion however I found
fastened to trees, and I ended a
Meeting in this effect. I find in
Rolleystones name is mentioned in
Hill Wade Rolleystone but I know the
is Chas Chichwood apas Chichmeadow - There
are four Late posses adjoining the
Jennoor Main Late posses Wandering
On them.
(Beyond) There is boundary distinct
Jennoor & Main Place of
Ummatten, but this does not apply to

marked

the ~~date~~ post date forms belong to Harry
Spencer late forms belong to Harry
Spencer Alley, both of Spencer All
Boundary disputes have been settled

There was a Meeting held on Wednesday
from 1861 that 9/ Income & pay has
been made - Display has been heavy
year carried till End of March 1867 -
The Display has been written off for
the subsequent period because there has
been no sale - Absent a month
of hearing news heard the Alley
found ~~that~~ one stranger into
Etta selling Lotty - On being asked
she said that one Thomas Lynde
had contracted for the entire Lotty and
given her the Lotty she had sold for him -
Recorded Malazan & Express - Post
Telegraph Papers now - It remains 4 or
5 months past as the period Lease the
Stranger has been to selling -

There has been no sale as
big time at Demahally - There are Lotty
forms & Lotty is Raven & Taken & other
steps - No Lotty has & may Rumble been
drawn from here in these forms since March
1867 - & so there is - Nor has there
been any sale - Many inquiries & have
do. / Th Raven & Taken for sale Elsewhere -

Mohrenga accounts are included
in the January of the Magn - I admire
- for the affairs of all the Magns belonging
to Desay are on my Esqm Visit -

Read & Sept'd Cawnpore

Sanctioned

Further

Whereas Mohanga Mohanty & Mayaram
Mr Jemadar in Subordinate Service
to the Magn Department Dakuit -

List of Exhibits produced by Papanna Agent of Desa Aro in abakari case No 16 of 1888 brought by him against the toddy Contractors of the Mysore District.

Exhibit A.

Executed by Messrs Davy Hoodapan & Co. Agreeing to pay to Papanna Agent Rs 123-a-6 Monthly on account of the toddy Rev: of the following 4 Villages.

	Rs.	a	p
1 Bagali	74	1	1
2 Jodi Jannur	38	3	5
3 Do. Demahalli	5	11	0
Sarvamanya Hoskote	5	1	0
Total	123	a	6

from 1st April 1881 to 31st March 1887.

Panchalcica Date 7th March 1886.

This is an enclosure to one of the petitions addressed by Papanna to Mr Lewin.

Exhibit B.

Statement of the Panchayetdars Collected for the purpose of examining whether toddy is sold at Bagali on 28-7-88 and 11th August 1888.

Panchayetdars say on examination that they found one Andige of toddy in a shop and another Andige poured into a pot in the house of Kokkasidda and that his daughter was seated there with a seer to sell toddy on 28-7-88 and that they found half a pot of toddy in the house of Hoondegowda at 5 P.M. on 11th August 1888 after half being sold.

This is also an enclosure to Papannas petition.

Exhibit-C.

Sanad dated 13th day of Jeota of the year Bahmdanya (1818) by the late Maharaja and Signed by him ——

No copy of this has been filed. Returned 5-5-89

Granting the 3 villages 1 Bagali, 2, Demahalli & 3 Jammur as Kayemgutta to Desehrs on payment of 2049 and odd Pagodas yearly In this the toddy Revenue is given to the Kayemgutta dar ——

Exhibit- D.

Copy of Sanad dated 8th day of Bhadrapada of the Year Vyaya (1826.) The original of this is signed by the late Maharaja. ——

By this the Kayemgutta tenure of Jammur and Demahalli has been Converted into Jodi and the Jodidar has been ordered to enjoy all the excess he may realize in these villages through his own exertion.

Exhibit- E.

Copy of Sanad granted by the late Maharaja dated 5th day Palguna of the year Sarvadhari (1829) The original is signed by the late Maharaja.

By this the Village of Hoskote is granted as Inam to Mr. Desehrs - In this the toddy right has been Conceded to the Inamdar

Exhibit F.

Copy of Sanad granted by late Maharaja dated the 1st day of Asvija of the year Jarana (1824) The original is signed by the late Maharaja.

By this the Village of Bagali × in the Chennarayanagar Talak has been granted as Sarvamanya to Mr. Desehrs for his house hold expenses. The toddy right has also been Conceded to the Inamdar

about 1024 and odd Pagodas

Exhibit- G.

a Mahazar signed Shambhog Venkatramaniah & 8 Others — dated 3rd Dec 86

These certify that they saw about 80 or 100 Sendu trees tied with pots to extract toddy when they were passing that side inspecting the land and yield of the trees belonging to Jodi Jannur. and that on Enquiry they came to know that one Vobay Gowda of Hakanur & Kanyadia Sidda tied these pots & extract toddy. —

Exhibit H.

a Mahazar signed by the Panchayetdars of Hoskote dated 10th February 1889 —

These on examination state that about 16 seers of toddy was found in the house of one Nanji and that they saw Nanji & two Others purchasing & drinking toddy there.

Exhibit I.

Deposition of Nanji taken by Papanna on the 10th February 1889.

She states that one Edigay Thimmegowda supplies her every day 16 seers of toddy for the past one month and that she sells the toddy for him & gives him the proceeds & that she is in any way concerned Toddy traffic - and before one month Thimmegowda was selling toddy, that she is not aware of one else selling toddy.

Exht J.

Extract from Dist Office Regr of Licenses issued at Sahukar of Hoskota

Licenses issued as per list received from Contractor

Recvd from the Amildar

Encl: 7

Inhabitants Report No 208
& 15 Engs & recd from
Amildar.

Returned to the Amildar

Sd/ Meanth DG

Report that there
are about 35000
trees in the three Mehals
of Bagalay, Jamnoor
& Dramhalli -

List of Exhibits produced
by Pairamca Agent -
of Desarajpet.

Rob Cole
14-8-77

Rob Cole
Sept.

$$= \frac{\text{[illegible]}}{\text{[illegible]}}$$

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

ಸಂಪಾದಕರು : ಎಸ್. ಬಿ. ಜೋಳದ ಮತ್ತು ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಪಂಡಿತ

ಸಂಪುಟ ೧೦ ಸಂಚಿಕೆ ೧ ಜನವರಿ ೧೯೭೪

ಕಾಲಮಾನ ಸಂಶೋಧನೆಯ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು

ಕಾಲಮಾನ ಸಂಶೋಧನೆಯ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳು ಕುರಿತು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಲು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಇತಿಹಾಸ ಅಕಾಡೆಮಿಯು ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರ ಸಂಕಿರಣವನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿತ್ತು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಲಾದ ಪ್ರಬಂಧಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಂಚಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಬಂಧಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲಮಾನ ಸಂಶೋಧನೆಯ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕುರಿತು ಚರ್ಚ

Compared
with Record
2/3/89

Bangalore
23 December 1899

My dear Rothfeld,

ਮੁਕੱਦਮਾ ਦਾਇਰ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਤਰੀਖ਼ ਤੋਂ ਛੇ ਸਾਲ ਅੰਦਰ—

ਹੇਠਾਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਕੇਸਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੁਕੱਦਮਾ ਦਾਇਰ ਕਰਨ ਦੀ ਤਰੀਖ਼ ਤੋਂ ਛੇ ਸਾਲ ਅੰਦਰ ਮੁਕੱਦਮਾ ਦਾਇਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਣਾ ਚਾਹੀਦਾ ਹੈ, ਨਹੀਂ ਤਾਂ ਮੁਕੱਦਮਾ ਖ਼ਾਰਜ ਕਰ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਵੇਗਾ—

ਕਿਸੇ ਅਚੱਲ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਦੇ ਕਬਜ਼ੇ ਲਈ ਮੁਕੱਦਮਾ।

ਕਿਸੇ ਅਚੱਲ ਜਾਇਦਾਦ ਦੇ ਕਬਜ਼ੇ ਲਈ ਮੁਕੱਦਮਾ, ਜਦੋਂ ਕਿ ਕਬਜ਼ਾ ਵਾਦੀ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿੱਚ ਕਿਸੇ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਦੇ ਆਧਾਰ 'ਤੇ ਹੋਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਉਸ ਰਹਿਣ ਦੇ ਅਧਿਕਾਰ ਦੀ ਸਮਾਪਤੀ ਤੋਂ ਬਾਅਦ ਕਬਜ਼ਾ ਪ੍ਰਤੀਵਾਦੀ ਦੇ ਹੱਕ ਵਿੱਚ ਹੋ ਗਿਆ ਹੋਵੇ

ਸੇਵਾ ਵਿਖੇ,

ਸ਼੍ਰੀਮਾਨ ਸਹਾਇਕ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨਰ ਜੀ,

ਜਲੰਧਰ।

ਵਿਸ਼ਾ:- ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਅਧਿਆਪਕਾਂ ਦੀ ਨਿਯੁਕਤੀ ਸੰਬੰਧੀ।

ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਜੀ,

ਬੇਨਤੀ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਮੈਂ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਹਾਈ ਸਕੂਲ ਪਿੰਡ ਰਾਮਪੁਰ ਵਿੱਚ ਅੰਗਰੇਜ਼ੀ ਦਾ ਅਧਿਆਪਕ ਹਾਂ। ਸਾਡੇ ਸਕੂਲ ਵਿੱਚ ਇਸ ਸਮੇਂ ਅੰਗਰੇਜ਼ੀ ਦੇ ਦੋ ਅਧਿਆਪਕਾਂ ਦੀ ਅਸਾਮੀ ਖਾਲੀ ਪਈ ਹੈ, ਜਿਸ ਕਾਰਨ ਵਿਦਿਆਰਥੀਆਂ ਦੀ ਪੜ੍ਹਾਈ ਬੁਰੀ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਪ੍ਰਭਾਵਿਤ ਹੋ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ।

ਇਸ ਸੰਬੰਧ ਵਿੱਚ ਮੈਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਵੀ ਕਈ ਵਾਰ ਜ਼ੁਬਾਨੀ ਅਤੇ ਲਿਖਤੀ ਰੂਪ ਵਿੱਚ ਬੇਨਤੀ ਕੀਤੀ ਹੈ, ਪਰ ਹੁਣ ਤੱਕ ਕੋਈ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ ਨਹੀਂ ਹੋਈ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਮੈਂ ਆਪ ਜੀ ਨੂੰ ਨਿਮਰਤਾ ਸਹਿਤ ਬੇਨਤੀ ਕਰਦਾ ਹਾਂ ਕਿ ਇਸ ਅਸਾਮੀ ਨੂੰ ਜਲਦ ਤੋਂ ਜਲਦ ਭਰਨ ਦੀ ਕਿਰਪਾਲਤਾ ਕੀਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ।

ਧੰਨਵਾਦ ਸਹਿਤ,

ਆਪ ਦਾ ਆਗਿਆਕਾਰੀ ਸੇਵਕ,

ਰਾਜੇਸ਼ ਕੁਮਾਰ ਸ਼ਰਮਾ

ਅਧਿਆਪਕ, ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਹਾਈ ਸਕੂਲ, ਰਾਮਪੁਰ

ਮਿਤੀ:- ੧੫/੦੩/੨੦੨੪

ಕೃಷಿಕರ ಪಹಣಿಕೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಸ್ತಾಂತರ ಕುರಿತು ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಆಇ ೨೦೦೮ ಬೆಳೆಹಾನಿ ಸಮೀಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಪಹಣಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಸ್ತಾಂತರಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

1989-90 ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಮಳೆಹಾನಿ ಬೆಳೆಹಾನಿ ಸಮೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಪಹಣಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಂದಾಯ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಸ್ತಾಂತರಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ.	ಹೋಬಳಿ	ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು	ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್/ಹಿಸ್ಸಾ ನಂಬರ್	ಪಹಣಿಕೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಪಹಣಿಕೆಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ	ಷರಾ
99	ಶಿಕಾರಿಪುರ	ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ	ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ	ಲಿಂಗದಹಳ್ಳಿ-ಎಂಸೈಮರ ಹಳ್ಳಿ-ಹೊಳಲೂರು	1	4	188 ಪಹಣಿಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. 1889 ನೇ ಸಾಲಿನ ಪಹಣಿಕೆಗಳು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 1/2 ಲಿಂಗದಹಳ್ಳಿ ಹೋಬಳಿ ಶಿಕಾರಿಪುರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 4-9-288 ಹೊಳಲೂರು ಹೋಬಳಿ ಶಿಕಾರಿಪುರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 376 ಕೆಳಗಿನಬೆಸಿಗೆ ಹೋಬಳಿ ಶಿಕಾರಿಪುರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 7-11-288 ಹೊಳಲೂರು ಹೋಬಳಿ ಶಿಕಾರಿಪುರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು 28-1-89

Extract.

21-3-89

ಸಹಿ.

Assistant Commissioner
Shimoga District

Extract.

21-3-89

Government

15-8-88

is the matter pending before you
Call for references at once

Sd/ C.S.
15-3-97

Excise Branch for early com-
liance.

Sd/ V.K.J.
20/3/97

Excise Branch.

1897

No. 2827

Name of Petitioner Rapanna - agent of the

Village Kanavarti of Devaraj Urs

Taluk Bijapur

District S.D. 11-88-12

Date of Arzi 12-2-97

Date of Receipt 20-3-97

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 2

ABSTRACT.

States that according to the decree passed by the Dy. Comr. a sum of Rs. 1752-10-7 is due from the Abkari Contractor on account of the toddy revenue of the Kanavarti villages - that five years has Elapsed & since the said decree was passed - that though he submitted several petitions for the recovery of the amount yet his request has not been complied with - that he has enclosed Endorsements granted thereon by the Dy. Comr. to the effect that order had been issued to the Amildar for the sale of the properties of Ramdappa and his partners

9-9 due by Wilgoda Pattuma for
Kawamanya village of Kahakote
[illegible] Sura of Rs. 13-4-6 has been
paid to the Palace Department after abo.
account - and that a balance of Rs. 6
still due.

Prays that early orders may be given
for the payment of the said amount
amounting Rs. 1768-12

[illegible]
[illegible]/97

Endorsements

Endorsement No. 89 of 4-11-95 Granted to
the Headmaster of Devarajawa.

Petition of 14-9-95 accompanied by letter of
the Dy. Comm. with Govt. No. 73 of 9-95
thereon.

2827

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
REG'D. IN

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Ref No: 7

26.1.98

28/27 Asst Excise Comr for early compliance.

27/1/98

No. 1841

Name of Petitioner Papamah

Village Manavarte of

Taluk Col: Desaraje Urs.

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 12-1-98

Date of Receipt 14-1-98.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

Petr, that he petitioned Govt: together with Mysore Dy Commr's Endorsement dt 12-2-97 regarding the payin of 1768-12-1, the abkary am pending for the last 5 ye Prays that Early orders may be passed for the disp ment of the same.

25/1/98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REC'D. NO. 1841/R
DATE 14-1-96

1841

By Post 14.1.96

ಮೈಸೂರು ದಿವಾನರ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಅರ್ಜಿ ವಿಭಾಗಕ್ಕೆ

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ವಿಳಾಸ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ನಾನು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಿರುವ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಪಾಠಶಾಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತ ಅಧ್ಯಯನ ಮಾಡಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸಿರುವ ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಣ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಚಿತ ಊಟ ಮತ್ತು ವಸತಿ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲು ಉದ್ದೇಶಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುವ ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಸಹಿ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೧೦-೨೨೬ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ ೧೪-೧-೯೬

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಳಾಸ

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರ ಸಹಿ

ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ೧೦-೨೨೬

ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಸಹಿ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್/ಕಾಮ/ಟೆಂಡರ್/ಎಸ್‌ಎಚ್‌ಡಿ/೨೦೨೫-೨೬/೧೨೩೪ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೫/೦೩/೨೦೨೬

ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಸೂಚನೆ

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಗ್ರಾಮೀಣ ಮೂಲಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಿಗಮ ನಿಯಮಿತ (ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್) ಮೂಲಕ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅರ್ಹ ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರಿಂದ ಮೊಹರು ಮಾಡಿದ ಟೆಂಡರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಟೆಂಡರ್ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಚೇರಿ ಕೆಲಸದ ದಿನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಪಡೆಯಬಹುದು.

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ. ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಹೆಸರು ಅಂದಾಜು ಮೊತ್ತ (₹) ಇಎಂಡಿ (₹) ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಶುಲ್ಕ (₹) ಪೂರ್ಣಗೊಳಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಅವಧಿ

೧ ಹಿರೇಬಾವಿ ಕೆರೆ ಏರಿ ಬಲಪಡಿಸುವಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಕೋಡಿ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ೪೨,೫೦,೦೦೦ ೮೫,೦೦೦ ೫೦೦ ೯೦ ದಿನಗಳು

೨ ಮಲ್ಲಾಪುರ–ಕೆಂಚನಹಳ್ಳಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ (೩.೨ ಕಿ.ಮೀ.) ೭೮,೦೦,೦೦೦ ೧,೫೬,೦೦೦ ೫೦೦ ೧೨೦ ದಿನಗಳು

೩ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಶೌಚಾಲಯ ಸಂಕೀರ್ಣ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ, ಕಲ್ಲುಗುಡ್ಡೆ ೧೨,೭೫,೦೦೦ ೨೫,೫೦೦ ೫೦೦ ೬೦ ದಿನಗಳು

ಷರತ್ತುಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳು:

೧. ಗುತ್ತಿಗೆದಾರರು ಕಾಮಗಾರಿಯ ಅನುಭವ ಮತ್ತು ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯದ ಪುರಾವೆಗಳನ್ನು ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಬೇಕು.

೨. ಟೆಂಡರ್ ಅನ್ನು ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾರಣ ನೀಡದೆ ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಕೆಆರ್‌ಐಡಿಎಲ್‌ಗೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.